

University of California - Davis

UCD-00-10
hep-ph/0004058
April, 2000**Extra Dimension Kaluza-Klein Excitations and Electroweak Symmetry Breaking¹****J.F. Gunion^a and B. Grzadkowski^b**^a *Davis Institute for High Energy Physics, University of California at Davis,
Davis, CA 95616, USA*^b *Inst. for Theoretical Physics, Warsaw University, Warsaw, Poland***Abstract**

We review the possibilities that the Kaluza-Klein excitations of graviton states induce electroweak symmetry breaking and that electroweak symmetry breaking could have a large impact on KK phenomenology.

In one popular approach [1] to extra dimensions with length scales far larger than the inverse Planck mass [2], ordinary particles are confined on a brane (having three spatial dimensions) with gravity propagating in the bulk. This talk² summarizes our paper [3] showing that the KK modes could have a dramatic impact on electroweak symmetry breaking, possibly providing the EWSB mechanism and how, in turn, EWSB could have a large impact on KK phenomenology.

We consider a theory with δ extra dimensions of compactified size L . In the standard approach [4, 5], a linearized approximation is employed in which the metric tensor is expanded to first order in $\kappa = \sqrt{16\pi G_N}$ about the flat-space limit to obtain an effective Lagrangian and corresponding equations of motion for the KK modes and Standard Model fields on the brane. Focusing on the Higgs sector, there are three key components to the resulting overall Lagrangian. (a) The Higgs Lagrangian, $\mathcal{L}_\Phi$, containing an arbitrary Higgs potential $-V(\Phi)$ that for simplicity we take to be a function of a single real Higgs scalar field Φ . The corresponding contribution to the energy momentum tensor is $T_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu}V(\Phi)$. (b) We also have the massive KK states, with masses $m_{\vec{n}^2} = \frac{4\pi^2\vec{n}^2}{L^2}$, where $\vec{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_\delta)$, and corresponding mass-term

¹To appear in the Proceedings of the 7th International Symposium on Particles, Strings and Cosmology, PASCOS 99.

²Presented by J. Gunion

Lagrangian, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}}^{\text{KK}}$. (c) The third key Lagrangian component is $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}}$ which contains the coupling between the graviton KK states and the scalar field, which mixing is automatic since gravity couples to $T_{\mu\nu}$.

We find that the mixing term can lead to non-zero vacuum expectation values for the Higgs field and the tensor and scalar KK fields in a certain class of models. To see this, one considers the extremum of $V_{\text{tot}} = V(\Phi) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}}^{\text{KK}} - \mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}}$. After minimizing with respect to the KK fields and substituting into V_{tot} , one finds a result denoted by $\bar{V}_{\text{tot}}$: $\bar{V}_{\text{tot}} = V - \bar{D}V^2$, where V stands for $V(\Phi)$ and $\bar{D} = \kappa^2 \frac{\delta-2}{\delta+2} \sum_{\text{all } \vec{n}} \frac{1}{m_{\vec{n}}^2}$. The extremum with respect to Φ is given by $\frac{\partial \bar{V}_{\text{tot}}}{\partial \Phi} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial \Phi} [1 - 2V\bar{D}] = 0$, with solutions $V = \frac{1}{2\bar{D}}$ or $\frac{\partial V}{\partial \Phi} = 0$. The 2nd solution corresponds to the usual minimum while the first is of a very unusual nature, as we shall summarize. Whichever extremum is appropriate, we denote the extremum values of V and Φ by V_0 and v , respectively. If we compare the values of $\bar{V}_{\text{tot}}$ at the two extrema, we find that the $V = \frac{1}{2\bar{D}}$ extremum is preferred if $\bar{D} < 0$. Writing [4] $\bar{D} = \frac{2}{M_S^4(\delta-2)}$, where M_S is an ultraviolet cutoff, suggests that $\bar{D} > 0$. However, the ultraviolet cutoff is the point at which the physics of the string enters. The exact manner in which the divergent sum is regularized is thus uncertain and either sign for $\bar{D}$ is possible [6]. (A simple example is ζ regularization for which $\bar{D} < 0$ if $2 - \delta/2$ is odd.) Thus, we consider $\bar{D}$ to simply be a parameter determined by the detailed physics at the string scale.

Given a definite minimum, we must consider an appropriate quantum state expansion. To this end, we first note that after substituting the vacuum expectation values for the KK fields into V_{tot} , one finds that the derivative terms for Φ receive contributions both from $\mathcal{L}_{\Phi}$ and from $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}}$ and take the form $\mathcal{L}_{\Phi} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}} \ni (1 - \bar{D}V_0) \frac{1}{2} \partial^\rho \Phi \partial_\rho \Phi$, so that, for the $V_0 = \frac{1}{2\bar{D}}$ minimum, half of the usual $\mathcal{L}_{\Phi}^{\text{kin}}$ derivative term is canceled by $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}}$ and we must rescale Φ in order to have canonical normalization for its kinetic energy term. We write $\Phi = \hat{\Phi} (1 - \bar{D}V_0)^{-1/2}$. The next step is to expand $V_{\text{tot}} = V(\Phi) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}}^{\text{KK}} - \mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}}$ about the extremum. The quantum excitation for $\hat{\Phi}$ is denoted by s . The important KK states in the expansion of the spin-0 part of the gravitational field are the non-zero ‘trace’ components with quantum excitations denoted $s_{\vec{n}}$. The excitations of the tensor parts of the gravitational KK modes do not mix with these fields and need not be considered. The resulting form for V_{tot} contains terms proportional to $s_{\vec{n}}^2$, s^2 , and possibly (see below) $s_{\vec{n}}s$ (all $\vec{n}$).

The physics at the two different extrema are quite different. If $\frac{\partial V}{\partial \Phi} = 0$, the usual type of minimum, one finds that there is no tree-level mixing between the $s_{\vec{n}}$ and s . (This is true even at the loop level.) The Higgs and KK modes remain in separate sectors. The case of $V_0 = \frac{1}{2\bar{D}}$ is more subtle. The mass terms for the quantum fluctuations are of the form $V_{\text{tot}} \rightarrow \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\vec{n}} [m_{\vec{n}}^2 (s_{\vec{n}})^2 + 2\epsilon s_{\vec{n}} s]$, where $\epsilon \equiv 2\sqrt{2}\kappa \left[\frac{2(\delta-1)}{3(\delta+2)} \right]^{1/2} \left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial \hat{\Phi}} \right)_{\hat{\Phi}=\hat{v}}$. We

then diagonalize V_{tot} . This is most easily done for $\delta \geq 4$, for which the off-diagonal entries in the mass matrix are always small compared to the diagonal entries. Even more importantly, the upper cutoff in $m_{\tilde{n}}^2$ to which we sum and which dominates the relevant summations is much larger than ϵ . Thus, for the relevant matrix entries, the $s_{\tilde{n}}$ KK states mix slightly with s with a mixing angle $\theta_{\tilde{n}} \sim -\epsilon \frac{1}{m_{\tilde{n}}^2}$. The physical eigenstate, s_{phys} , corresponding to the original s ends up with mass given by $m_{s_{\text{phys}}}^2 \simeq -\frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sum_{\tilde{n}} \frac{1}{m_{\tilde{n}}^2} \sim -\frac{8}{3} \overline{D} \frac{\delta-1}{\delta-2} \left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial \Phi} \right)_{\hat{\Phi}=\hat{v}}^2$. We note that the $\overline{D} < 0$ requirement, needed to ensure that we are expanding about a local minimum that is deeper than the standard minimum, is also that which implies a positive mass-squared for s_{phys} . In other words, mixing of s with the full tower of KK states and whatever physics is present at the string scale to cutoff the ultraviolet divergence of $\sum_{\tilde{n}} \frac{1}{m_{\tilde{n}}^2}$ is critical to obtaining $m_{s_{\text{phys}}}^2 > 0$.

It is very significant that the $\overline{D} < 0$ minimum can yield nonzero v at the minimum even if $V(\Phi)$ itself does not have a minimum with $\Phi \neq 0$. In particular, $V(\Phi) = \frac{1}{2} m^2 \Phi^2 + \Xi$ is entirely satisfactory, provided $V_0 = \frac{1}{2} m^2 v^2 + \Xi = \frac{1}{2\overline{D}} < 0$, where $v = \sqrt{2}\hat{v}$. For this form of $V(\Phi)$ we have $m_{s_{\text{phys}}}^2 = -\frac{32}{3} \overline{D} \frac{\delta-1}{\delta-2} m^4 \hat{v}^2$. For natural choices of m , to achieve $V_0 = \frac{1}{2\overline{D}}$ it is necessary that Ξ be negative with absolute magnitude of order M_S^4 , a seemingly natural possibility.

Let us now turn to vector boson mass generation. There are two contributions; one coming from $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}}$ and the other from the standard $\mathcal{L}_{\Phi}^{\text{kin}}$ kinetic energy portion of the scalar Lagrangian. After substituting the vacuum expectation values for the KK fields into $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}}$ and rescaling the Φ fields as described earlier, one finds

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}} + \mathcal{L}_{\Phi}^{\text{kin}} \ni \frac{1}{4} g^2 (\hat{v} + s)^2 W_{\rho}^{+} W^{-\rho} + \frac{1}{8} (g^2 + g'^2) (\hat{v} + s)^2 Z_{\rho} Z^{\rho}. \quad (1)$$

At this point, it is important to note that the W and Z fields themselves do not need to be rescaled in order to have canonical normalization. This is because, for any given V_0 , $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}} = \frac{1}{2} \overline{D} V_0 T_{\mu}^{\mu}$ and the $F^{\rho\sigma} F_{\rho\sigma}$ kinetic energy part of the vector field contribution to the full T_{μ}^{μ} is zero. Thus, we can proceed to read off masses from Eq. (1), from which it is obvious that one obtains the usual results for the W and Z masses. As for the couplings of WW and ZZ to s_{phys} , Eq. (1) shows that s has the standard couplings. For $\overline{D} < 0$, we rotate to s_{phys} , and find a small correction to this coupling of order $gm_W(\hat{v}^2 m^2 / M_S^4)$. This, and similar small corrections due to the small rotation from s to s_{phys} , will be neglected in the following discussion.

The fermion sector yields a surprise. First, examination of the kinetic energy terms shows that we must rescale to $\hat{\psi} = \left(1 - \frac{3}{2} \overline{D} V_0\right)^{1/2} \psi$. As regards the Yukawa coupling, for which we use the notation $\mathcal{L}_{\psi} \ni -f_Y \bar{\psi} \psi \Phi$, after rescaling both Φ and ψ one finds $\mathcal{L}_{\psi} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}} \ni -\left(1 - 2\overline{D} V_0\right) \left(1 - \frac{3}{2} \overline{D} V_0\right)^{-1} \left(1 - \overline{D} V_0\right)^{-1/2} f_Y \bar{\hat{\psi}} \hat{\psi} \hat{\Phi}$, where the $(1 - 2\overline{D} V_0)$

arises even before rescaling as a result of combining $\mathcal{L}_\psi$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}}$. If $1 - 2\overline{D}V_0 \neq 0$, then this simply amounts to a redefinition of the Yukawa coupling strength f_Y , which does not affect the standard relation between the $s\hat{\psi}\overline{\hat{\psi}}$ coupling and the mass $m_{\hat{\psi}}$ induced by $\hat{v}$. However, for the $\overline{D} < 0$ minimum, $1 - 2\overline{D}V_0 = 0$ and it appears that the Yukawa interaction is automatically zeroed (at tree level).

We next wish to point out that the basic gauge-theory interaction strengths are not altered by the rescaling required when $V_0 \neq 0$. For example, consider the interaction of the fermionic ψ field with a vector field. After the rescaling, $\mathcal{L}_\psi + \mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}} \ni \overline{\hat{\psi}} i \gamma^\rho D_\rho \hat{\psi}$, where D_ρ is the usual gauge covariant derivative, is of canonical form. This, in combination with the fact that there is no rescaling for the vector fields contained in D_ρ implies that the $W\hat{\psi}\overline{\hat{\psi}}$ and $Z\hat{\psi}\overline{\hat{\psi}}$ couplings are the same as always. The same remarks apply also to the interactions of the Higgs fields with the vector fields. Indeed, after rescaling, the Higgs kinetic energy terms have a canonical normalization; by making the derivatives covariant $\mathcal{L}_\Phi + \mathcal{L}_{\text{mix}} \ni \sum \frac{1}{2} (D_\rho \hat{\Phi})(D^\rho \hat{\Phi})$, which (when we expand $\hat{\Phi} = \hat{v} + s$) leads to Eq. (1) and, thence, standard gauge couplings for s . Clearly, the gauge structure of the theory is being preserved precisely because the vector fields do not require rescaling.

If $\overline{D} > 0$, then electroweak symmetry breaking is only possible if V itself has a minimum for non-zero Φ . A typical form is $V = \lambda(\Phi^2 - v^2)^2 + \Xi$, leading to $V_0 = \Xi$. In this case, it is important to realize that the Higgs self interactions induced by such a potential will not be related in the usual way to the Higgs mass if $V_0 \neq 0$ and the Higgs fields are rescaled.

An important question is how to resolve $V_0 \neq 0$ (required to be of order M_S^4 in magnitude if $\overline{D} < 0$ and most naturally of this magnitude even if $\overline{D} > 0$) with the known fact that the vacuum energy on the brane (i.e in our world of three spatial dimensions) is very small. We first note that adding an explicit cosmological constant that exists only on the brane is simply equivalent to shifting the value of the constant Ξ as already included in the Higgs potential. Possible solutions to the problem thus require introducing a nearby brane or other source of bulk cosmological constant that cancels V_0 on our brane. For the natural magnitude of $|V_0| \sim M_S^4$ (as certainly required for $\overline{D} < 0$), the cancellation between V_0 and the cosmological constant coming from the bulk must be essentially exact. However, we do not regard this as being unreasonable given that all these quantities will be determined by the ultimate string theory which might well have such an exact cancellation built in by means of symmetry or dynamics. An unresolved question is whether the bulk physics can be introduced in such a way as to have minimal impact on the linearized quantum gravity mode expansion employed in our treatment.

There are some very important phenomenological implications of our results. First, consider the popular KK phenomenology. We have argued that $V_0 \neq 0$ is possible even if $\overline{D} > 0$, and obviously it is required if $\overline{D} < 0$. If $V_0 \neq 0$, then the KK phenomenology

given in the literature will be altered. The crucial point is that if $V_0 \neq 0$ then the Higgs scalar fields and the fermionic fields must be rescaled to achieve canonical normalization. In addition, in the $V_0 = \frac{1}{2\overline{D}}$ minimum with $\partial V/\partial \Phi \neq 0$ there will be Higgs-KK mixing. Both effects will modify the KK couplings to the physical states.³ We have already noted that the vector fields are not rescaled, implying that vector-vector-KK interactions are not altered if $V_0 \neq 0$. In the fermion case, the Feynman rules [4] for fermion-antifermion-KK interactions will be modified by a factor of $(1 - \frac{3}{2}\overline{D}V_0)^{-1}$. For the $V_0 = \frac{1}{2\overline{D}}$ minimum, the coupling strengths of the KK modes to $\widehat{\psi}\widehat{\psi}$ are then obtained by multiplying the Feynman rules by a factor of 4. In the Higgs field case, the Feynman rules [4] for KK mode coupling to two Higgs fields must be multiplied by $(1 - \overline{D}V_0)^{-1}$, which is a factor of 2 for the $V_0 = \frac{1}{2\overline{D}}$ minimum. A sampling of the consequences are the following. (A) The effective contact interaction generated by virtual KK exchanges is multiplied by a factor of 16 for 4-fermion interactions and by a factor of 4 in the case of vector-vector-fermion-fermion interactions. This means that the experimental constraints on M_S will be increased by a factor of 2 ($\sqrt{2}$) in the respective cases. (B) The amplitude for radiating a KK excitation from a fermion (vector boson) is increased by a factor of 4 (2). This means that the upper bound on M_S extracted from experimental limits on KK radiation must be re-evaluated.

The modifications to Higgs phenomenology are also dramatic in the case of the $\overline{D} < 0$ minimum. Although the couplings of the physical Higgs boson, s_{phys} , to vector bosons are essentially the same as in the Standard Model, s_{phys} has no fermionic couplings at tree level. Its primary Standard Model decay modes will then be to $WW^{(*)}$ and $ZZ^{(*)}$ at higher masses ($m_{s_{\text{phys}}} > m_W$ or so) with $s_{\text{phys}} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decays being very important at low mass. Further, (invisible) decays into two KK $s_{\tilde{n}}$ excitations can be substantial (perhaps even dominant).

To summarize, we have found that mixing between the Higgs sector and the KK modes could provide a source for electroweak symmetry breaking even in the absence of tree-level Higgs self interactions. The proposed mechanism arises automatically if the KK mode sum $\sum_{\tilde{n}} \frac{\kappa^2}{m_{\tilde{n}}^2} \propto \overline{D}$ is cutoff at the string scale in such a way that $\overline{D} < 0$. Indeed, electroweak symmetry breaking occurs when $\overline{D} < 0$ whatever the value of the actual string cutoff scale, $M_S \sim |\overline{D}|^{-1/4}$, so long as M_S is sufficiently below M_{Pl} that the effective theory we employ can be defined. Even if the KK modes are not responsible for electroweak symmetry breaking, the phenomenology of the contact interactions and missing energy processes which they mediate could be greatly modified if the Higgs potential vacuum expectation value is of order M_S^4 , as is entirely possible

³However, the KK-mode induced mixing of $s_{\tilde{n}}$ with s , present at tree-level if $\overline{D} < 0$, does not lead to experimentally significant modifications because of the small size of the mixing angles $\theta_{\tilde{n}} \sim -\frac{\epsilon}{m_{\tilde{n}}^2}$ given that $\epsilon \propto \kappa$. It is only if one performs experiments at energies of order the cutoff scale M_S that the cumulative effects of these small mixings might become significant.

and perhaps even natural in the string theory context. Finally, Higgs phenomenology is very substantially modified in the case of the $\overline{D} < 0$ minimum.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.C. Davis Institute for High Energy Physics, the State Committee for Scientific Research (Poland) grant No. 2 P03B 014 14 and the Maria Skłodowska-Curie Joint Fund II (Poland-USA) grant No. MEN/NSF-96-252.

References

- [1] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. Dvali, *Phys. Lett. B* **429**, 263 (1998). I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. Dvali, *Phys. Lett. B* **436**, 257 (1998). N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and J. March-Russell, hep-th/9809124.
- [2] I. Antoniadis, *Phys. Lett. B* **246**, 377 (1990). J. Lykken, *Phys. Rev. D* **D54**, 3693 (1996). E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys. B* **471**, 135 (1996).
- [3] B. Grzadkowski and J.F. Gunion, *Phys. Lett. B* **473**, 50 (2000).
- [4] T. Han, J.D. Lykken, R.-J. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 105006 (1999).
- [5] G.F. Giudice, R. Rattazzi and J.D. Wells, *Nucl. Phys. B* **544**, 3 (1999).
- [6] J.L. Hewett, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 4765 (1999).